DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 809 FL 003 036

AUTHOR Bar-Adon, Aaron
TITLE Child Bilingualism in an Immigrant Society: Implications of Borrowing in the Hebrew 'Language of Games.'
INSTITUTION Laval Univ., Quebec. International Center on Bilingualism.
PUB DATE Nov 71
NOTE 54p.; In "Conference on Child Language," preprints of papers presented at the Conference, Chicago, Illinois, November 22-24, 1971, p264-317

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Arabic; Bilingualism; *Child Language; Children; *Childrens Games; Diachronic Linguistics; Early Childhood; *Hebrew; Immigrants; *Innovation; Interference (Language Learning); *Language Development; Language Patterns; Language Planning; Morphology (Languages); Multilingualism; Pronunciation; Second Language Learning; Sociolinguistics; Yiddish
IDENTIFIERS *Israel

ABSTRACT

The first waves of immigrants arriving in Palestine were faced with the problem of forming a new culture and creating a new language, actually, reviving Hebrew, an ancient language. The children were faced with creating their own traditions, games, and folklore; in so doing, through straight borrowing, spontaneous translation (loan translation), compounding, derivation of nouns from verbs and verbs from nouns, "contamination," and other processes, they managed to affect the lexicon, phonology, balance in morphological patterns, semantic ranges, and syntax of Hebrew. In the case of a revived language, children have a great deal of freedom to create and borrow in their own way. Gradually their innovations may affect the entire linguistic system. A great deal of borrowing and interference from Arabic is evident in the language used by these children as they play. (VM)

ED 061809

Child Bilingualism in an Immigrant Society:

Implications of Borrowing in the Hebrew 'Language of Games'

By

Aaron Bar-Adon

The University of Texas at Austin

[A Preliminary Version]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL 003 036

1. The National and Linguistic Hebrew Revival

1.1 The new wave of nationalism and national revival in Europe in the nineteenth century, and the oppression of the Jews, especially in Eastern Europe, which culminated in the Pogroms against them throughout Czarist Russia, combined in the latter quarter of the nineteenth century with the age-long yearning of the Diaspora Jews for return to their ancient homeland, for national revival in the Land of Israel ("Palestine"). The idea of return to full productive life on the soil developed independently among the Jews who dwelled in the Holy Cities of Palestine too, and the first Jewish agricultural settlement there (Petah-Tikvah) was indeed established by old-time Jews from Jerusalem in 1878.

A new national movement, called Hibbat-Zion ("The love of Zion"), which officially started in Russia around 1880, produced the first influx of immigrants, "The First 'Aliyah," to Palestine, which was then part of the Turkish Empire, and the first new settlements were established in 1882. This was an important milestone. The formal political Zionist movement started in 1897. Together with the national, political and social revival came the revival of the Hebrew language, indeed, as part and parcel of it. Moreover, modern Hebrew literature served to some extent as a catalyst for the national movement, and the very revival of Hebrew for regular, everyday communication, oral and written, among the heterogeneous components of the new Jewish society in the making in Palestine constituted an important factor in the general, national and social revival. In a way, it served as a cement for the entire process.

We cannot go here into details concerning the very process of the

revival. We do it in other studies. But several sociolinguistic phenomena and processes connected with that revival are of significant relevance to our present discussion, and we will therefore mention them briefly.

1.2 For about 1700 years (from c. 200 C.E. till the 1880's), Hebrew did not function as a living language. It was not "dead and buried" like its "sisters" Ugaritic, Akkadian, etc. It was passively used in the Jewish House of Prayer and in the House of Learning, and actively in writing religious, literary and scholarly works throughout the ages; also in intercommunity communication, in written community records, contracts, in Responsa, correspondence among scholars, and the like (similar to Latin in the Middle Ages). Here and there, now and then, there was some use of it for oral communication too, but it was not used as a living language for regular everyday communication. In this sense, Hebrew was a "dormant" language.

Since the first settlers of the First 'Aliyah (1882-1904) came mostly from Eastern Europe (Russia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, etc.), they did not have a real problem communicating among themselves, because practically all of them spoke Yiddish, usually in addition to the language of their home country. The problem arose when they had to communicate with those of their brethren who had no familiarity with Yiddish, especially the Oriental Jews who spoke Arabic, Ladino, Persian, etc. On some occasions, a spontaneous mutually intelligible "Hebrew" would somehow be used. Most of the pioneers did not seem to be bothered at first by this haphazard solution. But if they did not mind so much this abnormal linguistic situation, some of the leaders of the revival and the writers, many of the Hebrew teachers, and above all the first native children did mind. As we shall see later, the children were in the greatest need and hurry for an adequate linguistic solution,

while not everybody agreed on the same solution.

1.3 To make a long story short, there was quite a struggle on the language hegemony, especially between Yiddish and Hebrew, which lasted many years and flared up anew from time to time. Then there was the famous (shorter but very acute) struggle between Hebrew and German, mainly concerning the language for teaching the sciences on the advanced level, which reached its peak in 1913-14. And there was also quite a conflict between the proponents of the various traditions of Hebrew pronunciation as to which should become the standard pronunciation of the revived language. More specifically, the question was whether the Ashkenazi (roughly: the European) or the Sephardi (roughly: the Oriental) pronunciation should be adopted, and which variety thereof, or what should be the ideal synthesis. After a short but intensive polemic, the "Sephardi pronunciation" was selected by most of the teachers in Palestine, as it was by Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, the great fighter for the revival of Hebrew speech.[1]

But not everybody started speaking Hebrew automatically. The adults came to Palestine equipped with a native language, often with more than one. And while some of them came with a poor (or no) previous knowledge of Hebrew, others had a good knowledge of it from their religious studies. But even the latter had a great difficulty in expressing themselves on simple daily matters. Hebrew was still basically a classical, literary language, still unadapted for oral communication of a modern man in a modern society.

To be sure, languages have a "built-in device" for expansion and adaptation, and Hebrew eventually made it. But it took some time (accelerated as that process actually was) and enormous efforts. And there were quite a few devoted zealots who promoted the revival by teaching, propaganda, coining of new terms, and the like.

However, the problem of the adults was not nearly as acute as that of the children, as we shall see below.

2. Immigration into a "Language in the Making"

2.1 The mass immigration of Jews to Palestine, and the problems of resettling, cultural adaptation, and the like, bring to mind, for instance, the mass immigration to the United States, but there are very distinct differences. The U.S.A. was established by English-speaking people, and English has been the dominant language since then. Now, unlike the case of the non-English-speaking new immigrants to the U.S.A., who had to adopt an established new language, and in most cases also adjust, at the same time, to an entirely new, more or less stable culture, the first waves of immigrants to Palestine had actually to participate in the formation of a new culture, as well as in the creation of a new language: adapting a classical literary language to the needs of a contemporary modern speech community. Thus, the "revival" of Hebrew, or the "re-activation" of this "dormant" language, was, in a way, a new creation. It was neither a continuity of, say, Biblical Hebrew, nor of Mishnaic Hebrew or any other layer of Hebrew, but an "eclectic continuation" of historical Hebrew.[2]

Now, if we compare, for example, the case of the Norwegian immigrant in the U.S.A.,[3] or that of the Yiddish-speaking East European immigrant to the U.S.A.,[4] and the like, with that of the first pioneers in Palestine, we will notice a somewhat special situation of bilingualism, i.e. that the latter had to "create" or "recreate" by themselves the other language, Hebrew, which was ideologically designated to become their dominant language in the new culture-in-the making. This involved, under the pressures of the

rapidly growing language (and culture), spontaneous borrowings from various languages, in order to accommodate the diverse immediate needs of the speakers, particularly in the domains of lexicon and idiom, in addition to the planned developments in the language by the "Language Committee" (Va'ad Ha-Lashon), the forerunner of the current Language Academy, which tried to provide additional lexical items by exhausting the old written "sources," and in their absence--to coin new terms, etc. (Cf. Chapter 4.)

2.2 Inasmuch as there is a difference between a bilingual and a multilingual setting, this case is comparable with the latter, especially in view of the "Babel" of languages that the immigrants brought along with them to Israel. Yiddish and Arabic were most crucial for spoken Hebrew at the beginning, with English more recently as the runner-up, as we shall see in a moment.

3. A Bilingual (Multilingual) Setting for the Hebrew Revival in Palestine

3.1 Palestine was basically a bilingual country in the past few generations. Officially there was there a third dominant language, that of the imperial rulers, which was used in the Administration. Thus, while the language of the Arabs was Arabic and the major language of the Jews since the beginning of this century was Hebrew--the language of the Imperial Administration was Turkish through World War I, and English between 1918 and 1948. It was during the British Mandate (1922-1948) that Hebrew was recognized as one of the three official languages, alongside English and Arabic.[5]

The relations between the three major languages were quite complex. Relatively few of the native citizens of both sectors (Jews and Arabs) really bothered to learn Turkish during the Turkish Administration. During the British rule (Mandate), English was learned in the schools rather intensively,

usually as the first foreign language, but the British rulers were not liked by either sector, and this resentment was reflected in the attitude toward their language too. For instance, to demonstrate their resentment, Jewish school children who were required to learn English would often avoid learning the proper pronunciation of English. This was a special kind of revenge.... No wonder that English had a minimal effect on Hebrew at that time.

Interestingly enough, the study of English became more effective, English (rather, American) literature became more popular, and its impact considerably greater on Hebrew (and its literature) after the departure of the British and the establishment of the State of Israel, in 1948. First came some tightening of relations with the United States, and after some time came an improvement in the relations with England too, which resulted in greater influence on Hebrew.

Yiddish had unquestionably the greatest influence on Modern Hebrew in practically all domains of language. Second in significance was, in my judgment, the contact with Arabic, from the beginning of the revival in the 1880's until the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. Since then English has assumed a most important role in the Israeli culture, in its literature, journalism, and various aspects of the Hebrew language.

But let us go back to the earlier period when Modern Hebrew was still in the cradle and when Arabic played a most significant role.

3.2 Speaking of Arabic, one should remember that not only Arabs spoke Arabic. Arabic, and special dialects of Judeo-Arabic, were also the native vernaculars of certain segments of the Oriental (i.e. Middle Eastern) Jews, who are often labeled Sephardim.[6]

For some time, the veteran, established Oriental Jews constituted the

majority among their brethren. But later, especially since the latter quarter of the nineteenth century, with the mass immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe, the demographic composition of the Jewish community in Palestine did radically change. European Jews with a Yiddish (plus Slavic) background now constituted the prestigious majority and the Jews with Arabic background were soon a small minority.[7]

It should be, however, emphasized that Arabic used to be taught in many of the Hebrew schools (in some grade schools and in most high schools) in Palestine as a second foreign language, and that there were even some non-oriental Jews who acquired a good mastery of it.[8]

3.3 At any rate, the number of proficient Arabic-Hebrew bilinguals, i.e. of individuals who could speak both languages in a native or near-native manner, was relatively small. In other words, as pointed out by several scholars,[9] national bilingualism does not imply individual bilingualism. Often, for sociopolitical reasons, there are fewer (proficient) bilinguals in a bilingual country than there are in many monolingual countries. Then, there was a somewhat larger number of Hebrew-speaking individuals (essentially monolinguals) with a very limited knowledge of Arabic which does not justify the term "bilingual." The majority of the Jews in Palestine, however, did not know more than a few words and phrases in Arabic, which they usually acquired "second-hand," i.e. not from the native speakers of Arabic themselves, and hence they may have received it in a somewhat distorted form, as we shall see later. The important point about them is that they were those who actually forged and perpetuated the borrowings, so that many of the borrowed elements from Arabic manifest now the special features of "naive" adaptation and "innocent" language change.

4. Yiddish vs. Arabic

4.1 The difference between the impacts of Yiddish and Arabic on Hebrew speech is both qualitative and quantitative. Yiddish was at the base of the revival of Hebrew speech, providing the most significant foreign "substratum" for it (in spite of its rejection by vigorous revivers such as Eliezer Ben-Yehuda and other contemporaries), whereas Arabic, although important in certain areas, is less significant in others.

4.2 We mentioned above Eliezer Ben-Yehuda. He was not only the famous zealot of the revival of spoken Hebrew, but also the compiler of the most comprehensive "Thesaurus," A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew. On the one hand, he tried to comb the older sources for words which were not noticed before and which might be useful in the new situation, and, on the other, he incorporated in the Thesaurus scores of new words which he had coined himself. For cultural, sociological (socio-linguistic) and political reasons, he resented Yiddish more than all foreign languages. It was in the spirit of the Hebrew Enlightenment Movement of the 18th and 19th centuries to reject Yiddish, the language of the degrading Jewish Ghetto, even to refer to it scornfully as "Jargon," rather than Yiddish. But it seems to me (and this is also borne out by oral evidence from Ben-Yehuda's older daughter, Yemima), that he was also afraid of it. He was afraid of the danger of its becoming the dominant language, even of any kind of interference from it, since Yiddish was the language of the masses and of a great Jewish tradition in all of Eastern Europe. Moreover, it also started gaining prestige as a new literary language. Because of his resentment and fear he prevented his children (as his daughter Yemima told me) from playing with Yiddish-speaking children (but apparently not so much with others, i.e., Arabic- or Ladino-

speaking children, since there were very few Hebrew-speaking children in Jerusalem in the 1880's and 1890's), as he also avoided making use of it in his coinings.

In coining new words he would rather resort to old Semitic roots. He would make special use of Arabic for deriving new "Hebrew" roots and coining new useful Hebrew words, e.g. 'adiyv "kind," from Arabic 'adiyb; rəciyniy "serious" from Arabic raşiyn, or rəciynut "seriousness," Arabic raşa:na, and the like.[10] Not all of his coinages were accepted.

This was the planned development, which not always prevailed. But there were also unplanned developments in which Yiddish played a very significant role (and see below about Arabic).

4.3 As mentioned above, the first waves of Jewish settlers who came "to revive the Land of Israel," in the 1880's and thereafter, were predominantly of East European origin. Most of them were native speakers of Yiddish, or bilinguals of Yiddish and Russian, Yiddish and Polish, etc. It was not before the first decade of the century that the call of Ben-Yehuda and other outstanding contemporaries (since the 1880's) for the revival of Hebrew as a spoken, living language, and the crucial efforts of the Hebrew teachers, started to be really effective. Until then, the original mother-tongues, and Yiddish foremost, had been retained in full by the new immigrants, Hebrew being still regarded by various people as primarily a literary language, or as "the Holy Tongue" which cannot be reduced to ordinary speech. Certain fanatics violently objected to its use in everyday life, arguing that it amounts to profaning the Holy Tongue!

However, within a relatively short period (certainly short for such a project), Hebrew speech started gaining ground, and before long became the

dominant language of the Jewish community in Palestine. The pioneers gave up their native tongues for the sake of creating and establishing the new Hebrew vernacular instead. This was done for both ideological and practical reasons. Chaim Rabin,[11] basing himself on another scholar,[12] states that "the success of Hebrew was assured by the fact that among the immigrant groups which made up the Jewish population of Palestine, no one group had a sufficient numerical superiority to impose its home language on the others."[13]

Numerical superiority is, of course, a necessary but not sufficient condition. The most important factor would be the desire of the people involved, their concerns, aims, convictions, and the like. At certain stages the Yiddish-speaking individuals may have had the numerical superiority to impose Yiddish on the others, if they had really wanted it. But most of them obviously did not wish to use that power for that purpose. On the contrary, they used it for imposing (for ideological reasons) another uniting language--the Hebrew language, the historical language of the Jews; the language in which the Jewish people spoke to its God, as well as to its individuals. In short, the language to which the Jew had the greatest spiritual attachment.[14]

As noted by the sociologist L. Wislavsky,[15] there was a strong trend among the 19th century Jews to get out also of the "linguistic diaspora," and enter a "linguistic monismus." Indeed, for socio-cultural and aesthetic reasons they were sick and tired of the cultural and linguistic diaspora and pluralism, and were yearning for a linguistic unity. This inner tendency combined with the special age-long relation between the Jew and Hebrew when the national revival came into being. And when the need for a uniform language became crucial, even from the practical, pragmatic point of view (i.e. the need for a mutually intelligible language for people who gathered from,

literally, all parts of the world), the decision fell upon Hebrew, as the natural choice.

4.4 I have pointed out elsewhere[16] that the switch to using Hebrew in oral communication may have been, in certain respects, somewhat more "natural" for the Sephardi Jews. One of the reasons for it may have been their tradition of learning the Scriptures which included a lot of rote memorization of verses. On the other hand, it seems to be an established fact that members of the Ashkenazi groups were more active and more aggressive in the promotion of the Hebrew revival (but we will not go here into the sociological explanations for it). They were eager to impose the use of Hebrew on themselves and on others, and in a pronunciation which was meant to be the "Sephardi pronunciation."

But having that zeal did not mean that they could really rid themselves from the influence of their original Ashkenazi pronunciation or from that of Yiddish, and by reason of the weight in the population and the prestige which they acquired it was carried over to others too.

Since the East European Jews constituted the dominant element in the new community, no wonder that the impact of Yiddish and of Slavic (mostly <u>through</u> Yiddish) has been rather tangible in the lexicon and idiom, as it has in syntax (e.g. in the use of prepositions) and phonology. Yiddish phonic interference has been decisive in the shaping of contemporary Hebrew phonology (see below), including certain prosodic features (especially intonation). It is also apparent in morphology.[17]

4.5 With regard to Yiddish interference in morphology, I will mention here one instance which has special relevance to our topic, i.e., the use, especially by children, of Yiddish and Slavic (again, through Yiddish) diminutive and affective suffixes: -əl, le, -ele/-ale, -kele/-kale; (-ik), -čik,

e.g.: buba "doll"--búbale "dollie," ima "Mother"--ímale "Mommy," katan "small,"--katánik/katánčik "tiny," "smallie." Sometimes several elements will be combined, e.g. katan + čik + əl → katánčikəl (including basically a tautology), and sometimes even in addition to a genuine Hebrew diminutive, e.g. katan "small," kətantan "tiny, smallie," ktantančik "teany-tiny," as a double-tautology. These constructions are especially liked by children.

4.6 As far as the phonic interference is concerned, Yiddish was definitely, and unavoidably, the major source or cause of interference for the pioneer speakers of the revived Hebrew speech. The revivers of modern Hebrew speech had planned to adopt the genuine oriental pronunciation, or as it is generally called, the "Sephardi pronunciation" of traditional Hebrew, which included the realization of the so-called "gutturals," i.e. the glottal stop /ʔ/, the /h/, the pharyngeals /ḥ/, /ʕ/, the alveolar /r/, also gemination of consonants, realization of the shwa /ə/, the emphatics /ṭ/, /ḳ/ (or /q/), which exist in the pronunciation of certain oriental communities, etc. But most of it did not materialize. In effect, the Ashkenazi speakers retained their consonantal system with one exception, i.e. the elimination of the [s] allophone of /t/, adapting the Sephardi realization /t/ → [t] only. But they were more successful in adopting the Sephardi vowel system. Thus, while the vowel system of contemporary standard (informal) Hebrew is now basically the Sephardi one, the consonantal system is basically the Ashkenazi, with the exception of /t/ which lost the fricative allophone and is only /t/ → [t], as in the main Sephardi pronunciation, as mentioned above. The Yiddish background of those speakers certainly had a lot to do with it, alongside the reading tradition of the Hebrew text by the Ashkenazi Jews. They had their effect on certain phenomena in the area of stress too.

4.7 When the revival of the Hebrew speech began, a host of new terms, forms, and ways of expression were required in order to cope with the needs for a complete, normal daily vernacular. Historical Hebrew was rich in the domains of religion, philosophy, poetical expression and the like, but was very poor in the areas of prosaic daily life, in simple interpersonal communication, etc. This had to be provided fast and efficiently.

Most deprived of all were obviously the children and youth who were lacking any Hebrew tradition of games and childhood-folklore in the newly introduced Hebrew speech, and the adults were too busy or "aloof" to really accommodate them with their minimal needs.

5. Nativization of a Revived Language through Children's Speech

5.1 Some students of the revival of Hebrew failed to realize what seems to be a general rule for a revived language, as for a creolized language, i.e., that even if the language of the adults around them is still "hesitant," uncrystallized; even when it sounds somewhat unnatural, as a crude combination of old and new, archaic and modern--even then, the children who were born into this language in the new linguistic community accept it as a complete tool for communication, like any other language. And behold, while the adults may still stutter and stammer, unconsciously "translating" from their original native language, and the like, the children manage to use it more freely and more fluently, like any other native language. As we shall see later, the language of the children also crystallized as such, i.e., as a self-contained system even before the newly (re)created adult language did.

5.2 How is it possible that children who acquire a new language,

which was just created, or recreated, by the adults, can speak it more fluently and can make of it sooner a crystallized system than the initiators?

Obviously, it is possible, and there is really nothing paradoxical about it. As mentioned above, for the bilingual (or multilingual) adults, Hebrew was not a native language. It was usually acquired as a "second language," or additional language, either at the Hebrew school in their home country, or after their arrival in Palestine, while the first language acquired by them was Yiddish, or Russian, or Polish, or Arabic, or Ladino, etc. And there is a difference between first-language acquisition and second-language acquisition (also between early childhood bilingualism and adult bilingualism). Moreover, in our case, the adults revived spoken Hebrew on the basis of the enormous literary heritage in Hebrew. Their acquaintance with the various "sources" and layers did not always make things easier. It often created problems of selection between "competing" synonyms, morphological patterns, syntactic structures, etc., and it turned out that the richness and excessive variation of the sources impeded, in a way, the crystallization of the general language. Besides, the adults had their home language at their disposal, and could always resort to it, or draw upon it, whenever they needed or wanted, which was not the case with the children.

But the first native children were confronted with a different situation, the natural situation of first-language acquisition. Actually, they came to modern Hebrew only equipped with their innate capacity for language acquisition. As soon as they were exposed to some corpus of it, they started deriving (like any first-language learner or early bilingual does) a theory about the language in question, a grammar of the language.

5.3 The problem of first-language acquisition may need some further explanation. As humans, we are endowed with an innate capacity for language

acquisition, any language, not a particular language. And as soon as we are exposed, as babies, to the sounds of a human language around us, we start "working" with that material, creating internally a "theory" of the language that we hear. As soon as we have internalized a set of rules, we start using them and testing them by producing utterances according to this theory, predicting new forms and combinations beyond the corpus presented to us. If our utterances are accepted, all right; if we miss--we modify them and retest them, and so on. In fact, the mistakes that the child makes due to the so-called "false analogies" are the best indications of this process, and of his power of abstraction which enables him to perform abstract operations such as "extracting" a theory of a language, or to make a grammar.

This process of first-language acquisition through trial and error goes on and on for several years, while the child internalizes the essential theory, the rules of the basic speech patterns of his community language. In an established speech community with crystallized speech patterns, the language of the children will eventually conform to that of the adults, and will come very, very close to it. We don't just copy the speech of the adults, or use their performance as mere clichés, but rather induce their construction rules in an intelligent way. We develop a linguistic competence which serves us in our generating or producing new utterances.[18]

Also, we do not really reproduce exactly the same constructions and combinations that we have heard, in their entirety, and this is perhaps one of the major reasons for internal linguistic change in the speech of individuals, and by multiplication--in that of a community, and this is an important point. All those little deviations, all those little idiosyncrasies, or peculiarities of the idiolects, add up gradually, and are multiplied with use and distribution, with density and time, and in due course they become more

and more different from the original model, and more and more established in their new form, until another process of change will take place.

This is in the case of a well-established speech tradition. In the case of a less established speech, in a somewhat less crystallized linguistic environment, all processes are accelerated, and as in our case, the young speakers are usually given more latitude and flexibility, more freedom and opportunities not only for original creations, neologisms and "innovations" of various kinds, but also to maintain it for a longer period, within the framework of the new children-and-youth-cultures that they forge. As a rule, the less heeded and observed and challenged children are, while they speak, and the more independent and spoiled (and one might say arrogant) they become (which is quite common in an immigrant, uncrystallized "melting-pot" society) --the more they are tempted to create and innovate on their own, and the more they succeed in maintaining it and carrying it with them to subsequent stages of their development, as individuals and as groups.

Obviously, there was more in common between the different individually newly created "speech habits" of the adults than one would expect (although each of whom may have relied on somewhat different written "sources" than his colleagues and created his idiosyncratic "eclectic continuity" of Hebrew), since the fact is that the children all over Palestine came up with basically the same native language. Then, through the special ways of interaction between the children, the density of children's "generations" (see below), child folklore, etc., they succeeded in creating before long a more or less uniform, crystallized language, wherein processes of regularization prevail, and exceptions are reduced to a minimum.

5.4 However, one important link was omitted from the previous description, and it should be added now. We spoke about the prolonged problem of

the adult revivers of modern Hebrew in consciously forging the language, and on the "simple" and "quick" solution of the young native children. The missing link is, of course, that of the slightly older children, i.e., those children who were presented with Hebrew and had to switch to it not at infancy, but during their school age.

Let me add a brief sketch of the background. Both aspects of the revival, the national-political and the linguistic , date back to the early 1880's, but as I have stated elsewhere, it was not until close to the end of the first decade of the twentieth century that Hebrew became the language of the home and of the masses. Until then, for 25-30 years, Hebrew was spoken only in about ten homes, and was otherwise confined to the grade school. Why grade school? Because the first Hebrew high school was established only in 1906 ("Gymnasia Herzeliyah" in Jaffa-Tel-Aviv). So, Hebrew speech was used and propagated in the context of the school. The parents, by and large, continued using at home their native language, but the teachers tried their best to bring about the revival of spoken Hebrew by introducing it into the classroom, and inasmuch as possible also to the schoolyard. Thus, the first zealous Hebrew teachers undoubtedly have the lion's share in the realization of the dream of the Hebrew revival.[19]

5.5 But those teachers were a handful. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the process of the revival was carried out by the children. They were the ones (and by definition could be the only ones) who turned Hebrew into a native language. To be sure, the nativization of Hebrew could not start with the generation of the adult revivers themselves, but with their children. Theoretically it had to be done by their yet unborn children, but in effect it got off to a good start with the school age children who constituted the link in between. They carried it out from the classroom into the

schoolyard, and from the schoolyard onto the outside playground, or the street corner, where they continued their games, and from there into the street in general as well as to the house. And since the homes at the beginning were not Hebrew at all, the children were those who created the Hebrew environment there, demanding from their parents that they speak Hebrew with them, and often teaching them too. That is, the children often became the teachers of their parents, and their younger siblings, which is not an uncommon phenomenon in an immigrant home, except that here the "dominant" language itself was not yet in real existence.

5.6 For the first school children, who were technically <u>bilinguals</u> (with the language of the home chronologically the first language and Hebrew the second), through constant use of the new language at school and outside it, Hebrew became a near-native language. This process started even before the turn of the century. It reached its peak during the first decade of this century, at which time Hebrew spread to the infant stage and started becoming a full-fledged native language.

This process was facilitated through the following developments: First, the first generations of children who were at school in the 1880's and 1890's started their own families mainly in the first decade of this century, and for them it was but natural to bring their infants up on Hebrew. Second, the second wave of immigrants (the "Second 'Aliyah"), consisting mainly of the idealistic "workers,"[20] were more Hebrew conscious and were more ready to bring up their children in Hebrew. Third, and perhaps the most important factor, certainly for quite a while during the initial period, was the example which those Hebrew-speaking schoolchildren set for their younger siblings, including the infants at home, and the younger friends on the block."

5.7 This brings us to one of the most important aspects connected

with our discussion, i.e., the impact of one child on another, especially of the older child on the slightly younger one, and so on, in creating a children's culture (certainly, a new one), which is very relevant in our case.

First of all, let me introduce an extension to the concept of "generation." Adults conceive of generation as a 20-25-30 year span. But also the children refer to something like a "generation," which boils down to more-or-less a school year. Up and down the line, the difference between, say, a second grader and a first grader, then a kindergarten child, etc., is comparable in some respects, at least in the child's judgment, to that of a 'generation' among adults. An advantage of several years may give a child, especially a leader type, enormous authority and prestige among the younger ones: his power will be envied, his behavior will be followed and his speech habits will be imitated.

In this way, a special tradition of children's lore and language will be going on under the surface of the adult culture, handed over from one generation of children to the other, almost unheeded by the adults, and rather independently of them. The children determine, by and large, the "seasons" for the different games, i.e., when they start and when they end, and in what order, etc., which is transmitted from one generation of children to the other in a very admirable way. There are always some members in the children's community (e.g. the "leaders" on the blocks) who remember the time for the different games, and who preserve the rules of the games, the nomenclature and all the lore that goes with it, and the like, and thus maintain the continuity there. Indeed, all of it is part of children's life beneath the threshold of adult life.

5.8 In my judgment, this is what took place in Palestine too, i.e., while the adults were busy mainly in creating the new land and in forging

the new Hebrew society, the children were quite free to forge their own children's culture. This included the development of a new folklore, new games and speech habits which, as would be expected, did not conform to the classical forms prescribed by the normativists. They accomplished it through extensive "regularizations" or "simplifications," for instance in the domain of the verb,[21] massive borrowings especially from Arabic in the language of games and absorbtion of interference from other languages, for one reason or another. We cannot discuss here all aspects in detail, but would like to elaborate on the contribution of the first generations of the Hebrew-speaking children (within the initial bilingual setting of the Hebrew revival) to the development of the Hebrew "language of games," through borrowing from Arabic and other extensions.[22]

6. Linguistic Continuity and Creating a Hebrew "Language of Games"

6.1 As one might expect, a highly inflected language like Hebrew would provide, especially in the various areas of morphology, both inflection and derivation, more opportunities and challenge to level irregularities, and inconsistencies, to "normalize" patterns and to uniform paradigms; to regularize the system of expansion and derivation, and to establish more consistent morpho-semantic oppositions and proportions, and the like.

Naturally, uniformization which is quite common in living languages disfavors irregularity and divergence. Akin to this are the so-called "false analogies," which are actually not so "false," but refer in many cases to extensions of rules and the like ("legitimate analogies") based on the child's intuitive understanding of the language, especially when the latter by themselves seem "inconsistent," in one way or another.[23]

It usually takes a long time in an established language for such creations to crystallize into permanent changes (traditionally called "analogic changes"), since living, established languages have their ways of resisting, and at least slowing down, this process. It seems to me that this too is accomplished by the very system of linguistic continuity. Linguistic continuity, as it was implied from the foregoing, is obviously dependent on the children, who have their own ways of transmitting linguistic as well as other traditions. Yet, in an established language one may say that the adults "control" it to some extent, mainly owing to the density of the generations of native speakers of the language, i.e. of both older and younger who have gone through the mill. There is usually not too much in the language of the children that was not experienced just one generation before by their parents, including the important area of the language of games (and this does not refer to lexicon alone!), although neglected and forgotten as soon as one reaches adulthood. Of course, there are always developments in the language, from one generation to the other, but the linguistic changes are usually mild and slow, within such a period, in an established language. They may be very much accelerated under the pressure of the urgent needs of the speakers in a newly created language.

6.2 In the case of a newly created or revived language, and within a new society and culture, there are at the beginning certain domains in which there is really no linguistic continuity, because there was nothing to continue. All had to be started from scratch.

Among the most important and crucial areas of this kind, and of great relevance to our discussion, are those of childhood experience in the new setting, of childhood lore (folklore), of childhood games, and the like, and the expression thereof in the new language. Almost all of that special realm

of childhood play and fun (which I am tempted to call "the children's world of Sabbath and Holiday"), with the appropriate verbal interaction in the new language within the new setting, was "terra incognita" for them. The children themselves had to create it, since the adults could not have experienced it in Hebrew in the Diaspora, before immigrating to the Land of Israel. The language there was different, as the climate, traditions, and interests were different. Besides, childhood and childhood fun in the Jewish Ghetto were short-lived affairs.

6.3 The main tragedy of the Jewish children in the Ghetto (depicted in several novels of the period) was that they were deprived of a normal happy childhood, and, indeed, one of the ills which the new Jewish life and society in Palestine were expected to remedy was just that. It was one of the dreams of the new parents to restore the lost childhood to the Jewish child, to raise him in freedom and to give him more happiness and opportunities than those that were provided to his predecessors in the Ghetto.

This was certainly a kind and noble thought, but as might have been expected, some parents overdid it, providing their children with too much freedom and spoiling. Of course, this by itself would be of no concern for us here,[24] except that this social phenomenon also had linguistic implications: the general, perhaps excessive, freedom was also conducive to special freedom in linguistic creativity--self-creation according to the rules of the language (as conceived by the young speaker), as well as borrowing.

6.4 The situation can be connected in part with the fact that after all we are speaking of an immigrant society, with all that it usually entails, sociologically and linguistically: rapid destruction of the old way of life and slow development of a new one; abolishment of social frameworks; extraordinary widening of gaps between the generations--the young adapting faster

to the new life, and consequently developing tendencies of excessive independence, lesser regard for parental authority, even some arrogance, etc. The younger generation usually also acquires the language of the new country faster and better, and if they are young enough, they escape the problem of the foreign accent, and the like.

What was special about the children in the Israeli immigrant society was their significant linguistic contribution to the emerging modern Hebrew which would not normally be the case in other immigrant countries.

6.5 It would not be fair to say that the adults had shown no concern at all for the children's games. Certain attempts at designing new Hebrew games for them were definitely made by some well-intentioned teachers. But apparently they were not attractive to the children. Some of them were probably too artificial or too dull, and sounded "bookish" and too "adultish," like some of the first so-called "children's songs" which were devised for them.

Children don't go for such nonsense. They like a healthy authentic children's game, not anemic substitutes. And above all, they were anxious to play, and were not willing to wait for "appropriate Hebrew games" to be devised for them, nor were they ready to wait for Hebrew terms to be invented for them.

Ben-Yehuda's older daughter, Yemima (died a few years ago), told me in an interview in 1958 some interesting things about her childhood experience (in the 1880's and 1890's): "We spoke with mistakes upon mistakes ...," noting that she had not known "grammar." (She was, of course, referring to formal or normative grammar, which was not the business of the young native child!) She added: "We <u>spoke Hebrew</u>--the main thing was that we <u>speak</u>, and that it will spread, and that <u>finally Hebrew will be spoken</u>." Then she

commented that the Russian Jewish immigrants knew grammar, "but their children learned the language from the children outside, during games, and the parents had no time to correct them." In other words, we have here a direct evidence of a key witness to the period as to the significance of games for the spreading of the language, how children learned the language from other children, who did not know "grammar." But they were those that initiated native speech in Hebrew. And another interesting point: while the other parents did not correct their children's speech because they "had no time," she says about her father: "Dad did not correct, because he was afraid that we won't speak ... [we played] in a Hebrew full of mistakes, but he did not correct us, lest we say 'why do other children play in other languages without being corrected?!'"

The children naturally realized it too. For some time they used to come to their parents in the middle of a game to ask for Hebrew terms, but this is not a normal thing to do. Children do not like to interrupt a game for Hebrew terms, certainly not wait a while (sometimes hours, or days, or even weeks) until terms will be dug up or invented, when they were available to them from their friends by straight borrowing, or by some spontaneous translation ("loan translation"), or by derivation, and the like, which they could carry out by themselves on the spot. So they did, and thus introduced into the language an enormous number of forms (through borrowing, loan-translation, compounding, derivation of nouns from verbs and verbs from nouns, "contamination," and other processes) which not only affected the lexicon, but also the phonology, certain balances in morphological patterns, semantic ranges, and syntax as well. We describe the various aspects in other studies. Here we wish to concentrate on the effects of borrowing into the language of games.

6.6 As mentioned above, children's games are part of children's culture which is basically an independent culture, transmitted mostly from older child to younger child, rather than from father to son. And in the matter of games children certainly appreciate more the authority of the older child, the leader on the block, than that of the parents and other adults. In a way, one might speak of the children as a class, mysteriously united against the (international) tyranny of the adults.

No wonder that as soon as the children of the first influxes arrived in Palestine they made contacts with the veteran children in the neighborhood who possessed a more or less established game-culture. The fact that it involved in many cases direct contact with Arab children and the Arabic language evidently constituted no real problem. And before I go on to analyzing the related sociolinguistic solutions by the children, let me say a few words about the socio-political aspects of the relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine.

In spite of the instability in the nature of the relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine, affected by the political fluctuations (friendly-indifferent-unfriendly-hostile), contacts of Hebrew-speaking citizens with Arabic did not diminish. As mentioned above, there were Oriental bilingual Jews whose home language was Arabic, and hence Arabic was native for them, as there were others who acquired it later as a second language.

Palestine was not divided into two cantons, one for Jews and one for Arabs, or the like, but it was inhabited by both peoples, in either mixed or neighboring localities. There were several "mixed," bi-communal cities wherein Jews and Arabs either lived in separate neighboring quarters, or dwelled together in the same quarters, such as Jerusalem, Haifa, Jaffa (+Tel-Aviv), Zefat, Tiberias and for some also Acre, Hebron, and other places. The

same applied to numerous Jewish villages or settlements which had neighboring Arab villages, e.g. Petaḥ-Tikvah, Zikhron-Ya'akov, Rosh-Pinnah, etc. All of these places provided ample opportunity for language contact between Hebrew speakers and Arabic. Inasmuch as children's games are concerned, naturally the mixed cities mentioned above and Hebrew villages which were adjacent to Arab villages played the crucial role.[25]

7. Borrowing from Arabic and Resulting Interference

7.1 The contacts between the children of the two communities (in harmonious playing in times of peace, or in competitive games and children's "wars," whether oral or manual, in times of tension) have had great significance for the domain under investigation, i.e., that of the language of games, and of childhood lore in general. It has also affected various aspects of modern spoken informal Hebrew, and to some extent also formal (and even literary) Hebrew. I might add here that the boys were apparently more active than the girls in those contacts and borrowings, so that some distinction between boys' speech and girls' speech may be justified. This would apply not only to the choice of games and to the lexical items used in each, but also to derivative aspects (e.g. derivation of verbs from nouns), reinforcement of certain phonological trends which deviate from the normative, and, needless to say, the "four letter" domain, cursing, etc. (which accompany any "healthy" game), an area in which traditional Hebrew was very poor.

7.2 In discussing borrowings from Arabic two other instances come to one's mind, i.e., the elements borrowed from Arabic into Hebrew during the long period of the "Golden Age" in Moslem Spain (especially 10th-13th centuries), when Jews were very creative in Arabic too; then the aforementioned

"learned" words which were carefully and scientifically adapted by scholars like E. Ben-Yehuda, David Yellin and others, mainly from literary Arabic.[26]

But we shall concentrate here on those elements which were borrowed spontaneously by the young speakers from Arabic dialects in Palestine since the 1880's.

7.3 As mentioned, the children of the first newcomers to Palestine, who were mostly from East Europe, borrowed not only from the Arabic children, but also from Jewish children of the veteran population who used Arabic and Judeo-Arabic dialects as their vernacular, as they may have done also with other children who were originally speakers of Ladino or Yiddish.[27] At the same time, they turned to "self-creation," involving independent derivations, extension and "regularizations" of patterns (sometimes involving the so-called "false analogies"), and the like. In this way, hundreds of lexical items were borrowed from Arabic dialects, as a kind of "cultural terms," in addition to transfer of idioms and other usages, whether through direct or "outright transfer" or "loan-translation," etc.[28] In the same way, also Hebrew phonology and syntax were affected.

7.4 Borrowing begins, of course, with the individual bilingual, as interference effects begin with his idiolect. It will usually be multiplied by the number of bilinguals involved, and their "collective" impact on the general (recipient) language will be further reinforced when followed by other speakers, especially monolinguals unfamiliar with the contributing language.

It was stated by Haugen that for any large-scale borrowing a considerable group of bilinguals has to be assumed,[29] which was initially the case in modern Hebrew. But that statement needs some qualification, i.e., that it is usually a necessary condition initially. The crucial job of consequential

interference which has a penetrating and lasting effect on the borrowing system is carried out, in my opinion, subsequently by the essentially monolingual and the very poor "bilinguals" who cannot keep the systems apart.

7.5 Since it is a case of an emerging language, some of the interferences remained undisturbed with the speakers through youth and even adulthood, and with the new groups of fresh adults who were accustomed to those speech habits, they entered into general circulation.[30]

7.6 Let us have some sampling of the Arabic and "Arabicized" loans, each case followed by a brief analysis, before moving on to deriving some general conclusions about the effects of that child-bilingualism. Let us start with the games.

The lexical list in this category is quite comprehensive. It is probably richest in the case of the game of "marbles." It involved hundreds of terms concerning the material of the "marble," its size, color, texture, roundness, and the like. Then, terms in connection with playing with it, e.g. the ways of holding (the grip) and throwing it, forms and degrees of hitting, and missing; varieties and sub-varieties of games with marbles which involve different ways and shapes of arranging the marbles on the ground; rules for conducting the various games, preparing the ground before and during the game, etc., etc. Scores of those terms were borrowed from Arabic!

Although girls would sometimes play some mild games with marbles too, the real heated marble game was the domain of the boys. They would play it for hours and hours, excited and tense, and it is hardly necessary to add that it was very often accompanied by interjections, heated discussions, exchanges of "compliments," quarrels and the like--and most of it was usually richly flavored with Arabic elements too.

In short, the game required an extensive vocabulary of precise terms

for items involved (nouns) and for their description (adjectives), for their functioning and the ways to operate them (verbs), etc. It was also accompanied by a variety of special idioms and syntactic structures under the impact of Arabic.

7.7 Even the basic terms for designating the "marble" are illustrative of a variety of linguistic processes involved. The round "marble" may be made of rock or marble (now a collector's item), clay, glass, even metal. Most common were the clay and glass ones.

There were basically three terms, gul/ǧul [džul] and balóra, the first two used to refer mostly to the clay "marbles," while the last--to the glass ones. In the meantime also the clay marble has practically disappeared, and gul/ǧul became synonymous with balora. The difference is now basically a geographical rather than a semantic one (i.e., they are in complementary distribution from the geographical point of view): around Haifa and the North, balóra; in Jerusalem mostly gul-gúla, and in the Tel-Aviv area, mostly ǧul, but also gúla and bandora (see below).

Let us start with /balóra/. In the Arabic original it is /ballu:ra/, i.e. with gemination of the /l/ [balló:ra],[31] a form which was used in parts of Palestine and the adjacent Arab countries of Syria and Lebanon. In other places it was rather /bannu:ra/ (see below).

Not only the Arab children would pronounce it [balló:ra], but also the Jewish Arabic-Hebrew bilinguals (i.e., the Jewish children of oriental, Arabic-speaking ancestry). However, the predominant Ashkenazi (European) Hebrew-speaking children, those who had a very limited or little knowledge of Arabic, and who did not have gemination in their Hebrew phonology, adapted it to their system and pronounced it /balóra/ (and mostly with a "uvular" /r/, rather than the alveolar in Arabic). But they left the penultinate stress,

which is according to Arabic phonological rules, but violates the formal modern Hebrew stress rules (of the "Sephardi pronunciation"), as in baxurá "girl, young lady."[32]

The plural in Hebrew is /balórot/, i.e., with the regular /-ot/ ending of the feminine plural, but without the ultimate stress which normally accompanies the /-ot/ ending (as in [baxurá:baxurót] "girl:girls"). This is probably influenced by the penultimate in the singular [balóra], and coincides with the trend in other borrowed nouns with the unstressed /-a/ ending. The /-a/ ending signals the feminine, except that in genuine Hebrew nouns it is also stressed, as mentioned above.

Interestingly, children below the age of 4-5 years may sometimes say [balorót] with ultimate stress, applying their regular morphophonemic rules.

As mentioned above, there was in addition to ballo:ra (also ballu:ra!) another common form in Arabic, perhaps even more popular, i.e., bannu:ra[33] (and a plural bana:ni:r). This form would sometimes be used (switched to) by proficient Arabic-Hebrew bilinguals too (for instance, in the 1950's, in sections of Jerusalem populated by oriental Jews who knew Arabic well), but never by the non-proficient.

On the other hand, there were two other variants used by the Hebrew children mainly around Tel-Aviv: bandúra and bandóra. It is obvious that the "Hebrew" bandúra is derived from the Arabic bannu:ra, involving a process of dissimilation which reduces excessive nazalization and dissolves gemination, since Israeli Hebrew disfavors gemination:

nn → nd

This was already noted by Haim Blanc too.[34] He states that bandúra displays a dissimilation of the geminate sound nn, both because of its absence

in the Israeli Hebrew phonology and because of "contamination" with Arabic bando:ra "tomatoes."[35]

Blanc was not evidently aware that even the form bandóra itself was in use by quite a few children, especially in the Tel-Aviv area, and even in "islands" in Haifa (where the population was more "mixed"). I have first-hand evidence that many of those speakers actually perceived semantic correlation between the red "roundish" tomato and the round colorful marble, hence the identification of names--bandóra...

Moreover, some of the speakers were "convinced" that bandúra was an incorrect form, and "corrected" it to the "meaningful" form bandóra ("tomato). This is a kind of hypercorrection, with a semantic shift (bandúra → bandóra = "tomato"), superimposed on a borrowed form which had already undergone a process of adaptation (bannu:ra → bandúra), including vowel reduction (u: → u) and consonantal dissimilation (nn → nd). Our next example (ğula) illustrates another kind of hypercorrection (among other things).

Obviously, only a "pseudo-bilingual," i.e., one with a clear deficiency in, or only a smattering of, Arabic could come up with such an identification and a "hypercorrection." We will see later some interesting extensions of "interlingual identifications" (e.g., ná'al avíxa).

We observed a similar process of dissimilation, etc. (of nn - nd), in the form [laǧánda] used, for instance, when a marble is thrown far away, way out of the playing area, e.g., in 'af laǧánda "It flew to the ğanda...." This expression was quite puzzling to me until it occurred to me that laǧánda is a metathesis of the Arabic form li-ğahannam "to hell."[36] The preposition li "to" is adapted to the morphophonemic rules of its Hebrew counterpart, and becomes la; the /h/ is neutralized, since it is very rarely realized in native informal (non-oriental) Israeli speech; and the final nasal is deleted. Thus,

the form laǧána is obtained.[37] It then turns into laǧanda after the application of the rule: nn -> nd.

And sure enough, Arab children use the corresponding expression ta:r liǧahannam "it flew to hell" in a similar context. I also heard it from proficient bilinguals, who might combine it in a Hebrew sentence 'af laǧahánnam "it flew to hell."

The proficient bilingual of Hebrew-Arabic knows the word ǧahannam from other contexts too, and it is therefore very unlikely that he would metathesize liǧahannam ("to hell") to laǧanda. This could have been created only by speakers of Hebrew who heard it only in this context and did not know its exact meaning anyway. After having been in use for some time among such speakers, it would be transmitted to succeeding "generations" of children as an integral term of the Hebrew language of games. It is conceivable that after being in circulation for some time, even native Arabic-Hebrew bilinguals could no longer recognize its origin and they might start using it too. This is, then, one of the ways for metathesized "ignorant" loanshifts to be fed back to proficient bilinguals, and to become part of their usage in the borrowing language too (in this case, Hebrew).

All three forms, balóra, bandúra, and bandóra, have the feminine ending /-a/, like in Hebrew (although in Hebrew proper this /-a/ is stressed, "ultimate," while in the Arabic it is penultimate). For the plural, the Hebrew speaker will not use the Arabic plural (bana:ni:r, etc.), but use his Hebrew morphological and morphophonemic rules, i.e., add the plural feminine ending -ot, which will yield balórot, bandúrot, bandórot. Retaining the penultimate stress, instead of the ultimate, will be though in violation of the formal Hebrew stress rules. But Hebrew child language is full of such penultimatizations in loan-words. As mentioned, even native Hebrew words, which

normally have the stress on the ultimate syllable, may become penultimate and even antepenultimate (which never occurs in formal Hebrew), in the language of games. A few examples should suffice:

ríšon "first" (masc.) (normally rišón)

šéni "second" (masc.) (normally šení)

šlíši "third" (masc.) (normally šliší)

revíʻi/révi'i "fourth" (masc.) (normally revi'í)

And in the feminine: rišóna/ríšona "first" (fem.) (normally rišoná), etc.

One may say that this counting is often connected with chanting, which does not favor ultimate stress, but it also appears in words that are not chanted (e.g., kláfim "cards" and prásim "picture prizes" that were mentioned above). On the other hand, almost all the terms borrowed from Arabic are penultimate, including the corresponding ordinal numbers: 'áwwal "first" (masc.), tá:ni "second," etc. This may be more than a mere coincidence!

In other words, it is quite possible that the "penultimatization" of the Hebrew language-of-games is due, at least in part, to the impact of Arabic.

In this process, the proficient Arabic-Hebrew bilingual may be as much responsible as the other, because it does not involve or manifest ignorance in one language or the other as in the previous cases.

7.8 The other terms for "marble," gul/ğul, gúla/ gulá/ğúla (which originally referred mainly to clay "marbles") display other interesting processes of borrowing and interference.

Which of these variants is conceived as "genuine Arabic" and which as Hebrew?

Let us start with a vivid description by one of the foremost native Israeli novelists (born around 1920), Moshe Shamir, within a delightful chapter about the children's game of marbles.[38] It reads as follows: "Take between

your fingers, for instance, that roundish slippery object which is (already) called nowadays gula, in the Hebrew language, but in those days we still used to call it plainly ğul, in the Arabic language, if it was made of clay, and bandura[39] (also, in the Arabic language), if it was made of glass."

Before analyzing his statements, let me quote a few lines from a conversation with a ten-year-old girl (in Haifa, in 1958) about the use of Arabic words in the children's vernacular. When she pointed out that ğalekh is an Arabic word, I asked her: "How do you determine that a word is Arabic?" She answered: "... I guess... As a rule, a word with /ğ/, and with /ʕ/, is Arabic--this is what determines..."

At another point in the lengthy conversation with her, I asked her:

--Do you think that gúla is Arabic?

--Gúla--No! Gúla is in Hebrew!--she replied.

--Have you heard the form ğúla?

--ğúla is in Arabic!

Her statements and criteria, then, coincide with those of Mr. Shamir's (in spite of the thirty year gap), i.e., that ğúla is taken to be Arabic because of the sound /ğ/, which is not part of the native phonemic inventory of modern Israeli Hebrew, whereas gúla is conceived as Hebrew, because it has /g/ rather than /ğ/.

The peculiar thing about ğul/ğúla is that it does not exist as such (nor as ğull/ğulla) in any major Arabic dialect, while surprisingly enough, gull/gulla (gulle) is the standard pronunciation, not only in Egyptian Arabic (where classical /ğ/ → [g]), but in all other Arabic dialects which I have examined so far, especially in those where /ğ/ is realized as [j] (affricate [dž]; or by some as [ž]), not [g].[40]

This raises a few questions.

--If in all Arabic dialects the pronunciation is with /g/, rather than /ǧ/, how did the /ǧ/ creep into the speech of the Israeli children?

--Evidently, they themselves introduced it.

--Who are "they"--the proficient bilinguals or the pseudo-bilinguals (or monolinguals)?

--Obviously the latter, since the former knew very well that in Arabic it is gull/gulla (gulle).[41]

--Why did they introduce it?

--This is actually a hyper-correction. They wanted to make sure that this word, which they suspected was borrowed from Arabic, really sounded Arabic! In their innocent mind, the identification mark of Arabic is the /ǧ/, not the /g/. They were afraid that their colleagues who borrowed it directly from Arabic had already made the change (ǧ -> g), so they wanted to restore to it the "original" Arabic sound--therefore they changed it "back" to /ǧ/--and ended up with ǧula... It was therefore quite amusing to hear some pseudo-bilinguals show off with their "knowledge" of Arabic by pronouncing it not only as ǧula, but even with gemination, as ǧúlla.

On the other hand, through another process of interlingual identification, they identified /gúla/ with the genuine Hebrew word gu(l)lá (which may also mean "ball," e.g. on a pillar), and therefore both of the above mentioned witnesses, and many others that I have interviewed, maintained that gula was Hebrew...

I should like to return for a moment to another aspect of Mr. Shamir's statement, i.e., to his "historical" observations. According to him, earlier in the history it was called "plainly ǧul, in Arabic," and only later was introduced the form gula which is Hebrew. Well, Mr. Shamir picked up history from his own childhood days (i.e., in the 1920's and 1930's). But if we go

back to the children of the first influxes (around the turn of the century), who made the first direct contacts with the native speakers of Arabic (both Arabs and oriental Jews), they undoubtedly started with gúl(l)a, and only those who obtained it from them second-hand changed it to ğúla, out of ignorance, to give it a more Arabic flavor....

7.9 Children's borrowings, especially those that we might call "second degree borrowings" (i.e. direct or indirect borrowings by the non-proficient bilinguals), often bear a special flavor of innocence and naivety, even when they are slangish forms, vulgar terms and downright profanity. This can be easily concluded from their semantic extensions and shifts, as well as from their interlingual identifications, and the like. It goes without saying that processes of "depluralization,"[42] and "degenderization,"[43] and the like, which are commonly mentioned in the literature on bilingualism and interference between language in contact,[44] were quite common in our case too, as were those of "contamination" or "hybrid creation," of euphemism and "semantic raising," and the like.

Here too, several representative examples should suffice for our purposes: ábu "the father of." It is usually in the construct state, except for connotation no. 3, where it is in the absolute state.

Following the Arabic it is used (1) for denoting "the father of" in compound proper names, e.g. 'abu-bakr "Abu-Bakr" (lit. "the-father-of-Bakr"). (2) for designating "ownership, possession of ...," e.g. 'abu-gull "the owner of a marble," i.e. one who gained a marble in the game (all in Arabic); or abu tne:n (Arabic) "the possessor of two," referring to one who gained two marbles, or two other items in a different game, and so on. Incidentally, it was quite customary to use Arabic numbers too, which means that almost all "real" players of marbles, and a few other games, had to know to count

in Arabic, at least till ten, as part of the game requirements (which by itself did not imply "bilingualism"). It is interesting, though, that one who had no "kills," "the father of nothing" was not transferred in full from Arabic (_'abu ṣifr_ "the father of zero"), but resulted in a compound, "hybrid creation,"[45] using the Arabic _abu_-"father of" and the Hebrew _éfes_ "zero," i.e., _ábu éfes_ "the father of zero." If you wanted to know how many marbles were already gained by your opponent during any individual game, you would ask him _ábu káma ata_ "the father (owner) of how many [are] you?" where _abu_ is the element borrowed from Arabic and the rest being Hebrew. This, again, corresponds to Arabic, word by word (and may be a translation thereof), but not the entire expression was borrowed "alive" from Arabic.

Now, what is interesting here is that in Hebrew the term _abu_ was used not only for boys but also for girls, which is an instance of degenderization.

Another development took place later, in the 1950's, when _abu_-started to be combined also with Hebrew numbers, e.g. _abu-šnáyim_ "the father of two," replacing the Arabic "_abu tne:n_," etc.

(3) A semantic shift in the use of _abu_ by Hebrew speakers (not shared by Arabic speakers) soon took place when the semantic range of _abu_ was extended from the ownership of gains to the gains themselves, to the "loot." Thus, if you have some gained marbles, and you are "hit" by another player, he will demand _ten li et ha-abu šelxa_ "Give me the _abu_ of yours," i.e., your "loot." This special use was limited to children's games.

7.10 But the use of _abu_ + Noun became quite productive, especially when the appended noun was in Hebrew, rather than in Arabic. It started with constructions like _ábu-árba'_ "the father of four [eyes]" (used as a derogatory nickname for one who wears glasses) which was adopted from Arabic _'abu 'arbaʕ_.

Since "four" in Hebrew and Arabic sound "alike," the Hebrew word eynáyim "eyes" was soon added to that nickname abu árba(ʔ) eynáyim "The father of four eyes." By the way, it was used for girls too--which is another case of degenderization.

Then, there was another nickname, abu miškafáyim "The father of spectacles" (miškafáyim is "spectacles" in Hebrew). Now, there is a parallel expression in Arabic too (abu na..a:ra:t), and the question is, whether it is a loan translation from Arabic or an extension of the productive construction abu + Noun developed by the Hebrew speakers themselves.

To be sure, if the first is true--then it should have been initiated by proficient bilinguals who know both languages well and could safely translate "useful expressions" like that from one language to the other. However, if the second is correct--it could have been done by either kind (perhaps more likely by the non-proficient bilingual). What is the truth?

A closer examination (and comparison with other instances which I encountered in this context) will reveal that, as a rule, translations of this kind are initiated by the proficient bilinguals, mostly when they have to communicate with those who are not acquainted with "the other language" (in this case Arabic) as they are, when they are afraid that a "nice expression" will be lost on them. Moreover, pseudo-bilinguals in such situations would do their best to retain the borrowed expression, perhaps to show off a little. And it should be stated here that the tendency to show off with the knowledge of Arabic was quite strong among the Ashkenazi (European) descendants whose home language was not Arabic, which is quite understandable. This tendency was less common among the Oriental Middle Eastern Jews who were usually proficient speakers of Arabic--some did not need it, and others did not want it, especially those who may have preferred to assimilate among their "prestigious"

Ashkenazi brethren. Yet there were quite a few speakers of "Sephardi" (Oriental) origin who were very proud of their heritage and would proudly retain their Oriental pronunciation of Hebrew, and at the same time not conceal their knowledge of Arabic. But they were far from being a majority.

Naturally, once a translation of this kind is initiated by a proficient bilingual, it may enter into the general circulation and become part and parcel of a new language tradition, and as such be used by anyone, but, again, it must have started with a proficient bilingual! And there are other examples to support it.

As a productive construction abu + Noun where "Noun" can be supplied by either Arabic or Hebrew, the form abu miškafáyim would have been produced by either kind. The extent of the productivity of this formula can be more fully appreciated from the fact that young Hebrew speakers with only a fragmentary knowledge of Arabic would sometimes substitute "Noun" with Arabic words which may not be used at all by native Arabic speakers in that construction... It is, therefore, quite possible that abu miškafáyim was produced as an instance of a secondary impact of Arabic which provided Hebrew with a formula abu + Noun rather than the primary one of straight translation. Naturally, such a case has some significance for the general theory of bilingualism too.

7.11 An amazing development is represented in the related form avi-arba-eynagim which I heard from some children. The special thing is not so much in the fact that abu was translated into its Hebrew equivalent 'avi- (which is the formal construct state of 'av "father"), but that this formal construct-state was used at all, since the children like to use the (Aramaicized) form ába for "father, dad," rather than 'av, and then obviate its construct-state form by using the periphrastic construction aba šel...

"father of..."

I might have been inclined to view the latter case as an inconsequential use by some "formally, or classically minded kid" who resorted to this use, if I had not noticed the use of aba by the children in the inflected form too! But this requires some explanation.

In Biblical Hebrew, the possessive is expressed almost exclusively by inflecting the noun, adding the possessive pronominal suffixes according to person, gender and number, e.g. sus "horse," susi "my horse," susxa "your (masc. sing.) horse," susex "your (fem. sing.) horse," etc. In post-Biblical Hebrew we find also some use of the preposition šel,[46] in the proper inflection, e.g. ha-sus šeli "The horse of mine" parallel to susi, etc. Classicists prefer the Biblical method; in informal modern Hebrew it diminished greatly; in children's language--it has almost disappeared.

Why did it disappear in child language! We do not want to invoke here the much debated principle of "least effort," but it is clear that it is simpler to use a system where the nouns remain in the absolute state and only the preposition šel is inflected, than inflecting the nouns themselves, which involves a host of morphological patterns and morphophonemic changes (rules), in both the inflection of the nouns with the possessive pronominal suffixes and in the use of the construct state. For this reason, the latter is avoided too, through the use of šel as mentioned above.

This has been the prevailing trend. And all of a sudden we hear not only aví arba eynáyim (not: ába šel arba eynáyim), but also 'éved avíxa aní?! "your father's servant am I?!" (when asked to do some service to someone), involving both a construct-state and an inflection not ha-'eved šel aba šelxa ani?! "The servant of the father of yours am I?!," or in the curse naal avíxa "your father's shoe!" What is the rational?

Apparently all of it was influenced by Arabic: "Am I your father's servant" is a straight translation from a similar Arabic expression (xadda:m abu:k ana) which has the same syntactic structure and with the same word order,[47] and the etymology of two of the components is very close. No wonder that avixa is inflected too, like the Arabic Abu:k.

As for "Your father's shoe!" as a curse, this is borrowed from Arabic too, through a process of "contamination" and "hybrid creation" and "concealment," as it often happens in slang, especially in a bilingual setting. The corresponding colloquial Arabic curse is (yin al, or) 'in al abuk "[May He] curse your (masc. sing.) father" (remember abu-"father"). As mentioned above, Hebrew had no living tradition of cuss words. The adults could perhaps dig up some classical curse, or resort to their Russian, Yiddish, etc. The first Hebrew speaking children preferred to make extensive use of the rich Arabic cursing vocabulary. Many cuss words remained as loan words in Hebrew. Some, like the one under consideration, merited also loan translations and other linguistic processes, as we shall see in this case.

'insal abu:k was, then, borrowed (alongside other cuss words, games terms, etc.), and through assimilation in the Hebrew phonology it sounded more like in(')al abuk. Soon some "blending" came in,[48] in the form of 'in(ʕ)al avíxa, i.e. translating the part of "your father" into Hebrew, and in the inflected (formal) form avíxa (not ába šelxa)! It is obvious that it was done under the influence of the corresponding Arabic form abu:k. This also allowed the "proper" use for gender and number too, e.g., 'in(ʕ)al avix to feminine singular, etc. In this manner, Arabic contributed to the use of the neglected inflection in the noun!

A subsequent development was in the association of the "Hebraized" form in(')al (originally a verb) with the Hebrew noun ná(')al "shoe," and,

as a matter of fact, in a complete interlingual identification, which produced strange "curses," like the following (which cannot make sense without knowing their Arabic origin): <u>ná'al avíxa bezug na'aláyim</u> "your father's shoe for a pair of shoes," and <u>ná'al avíxa bezug na'aley iméxa</u> "your father's shoe for a pair of shoes of your mother," and the like. This "identification" too should have been initiated by the non-bilingual, who did not know the exact meaning of <u>'inqal</u> in Arabic.

Even without going into further detail, we can see how Arabic influenced not only the domains of play words and cuss words, but also some processes in Hebrew morphology, phonology, etc. and how this case may be useful for the general study of the processes of language interference in child bilingualism.

One can take it for granted that the children did not know, in most of the cases, the exact meaning of the cuss words they used in the heat of the game, following the pattern of their Arab neighbors. They needed something "powerful," and the stranger sounding a word in this area is, the more magic and power it may have. Therefore such words and expressions are not usually translated as a whole. They may be metathesized, blended, substituted in part by a similarly sounding morpheme or word in the borrowing language, and the like, but not translate it in full. If children understand the exact meaning--then its use in the borrowed form serves as a "cover" (euphemism), to some extent; if they don't know the exact meaning--then all the magic is in the strange sounds, which one would not like to change.

Let me mention one instance of profanity which was obviously not understood by the children. A most common expression in Arabic is <u>kus emmak</u>... "Your mother's womb..." This was, of course, transferred by the native Arabic-Hebrew bilingual into their Hebrew speech, and was immediately picked

up by the other Hebrew speaking children. That the latter obviously did know the meaning of the key word because they extended it to kus abuk "your father's womb" as well, on the pattern of the aforementioned expressions about the father in'al abuk → n'al abuk → naal avixa (Hebrew), which could be extended to the mother too.

Apparently what such fragmentary bilinguals do is that they try to make full use of their limited speech samples by applying their general construction rules to that linguistic segment too, and thus come up with constructions which are either unacceptable to the native speaker of the other language, or that are semantically impossible (like in the last instance). But we don't want to explore here the entire domain.

For students of the development of slang I might add the following data: the original form of "your mother's womb" after integration into the Hebrew phonology sounded like Kuséma (the final consonant dropped and the gemination eliminated). This form soon triggered a "contamination" (often for concealment) with the Hebrew word kus(s)met "spelt," on the one hand, and with kos soda "a glass of soda!" where the Arabi "key word" was associated with the "similar" Hebrew word kos "glass," and a new original, rather than hybrid (veiled), curse came into being: kos sóda "a glass of soda!"

8. Before moving on to some conclusions let us have a quick look at some phonological, derivative and morphological, and syntactic effects on Hebrew through the children's bilingualism and their language of games.

We mentioned before the forms ǧul and ǧula which were "hypercorrected" by the Hebrew children, instead of the Arabic (unique) use with [g], because the ǧ has become an identification mark for Arabic in the eyes of the innocent Hebrew speaker. They had in active use such words with ǧ as ǧora "pot, a hole

in the ground for the game of marbles" and terms in the game like be-ğaxes/ bli ğaxes, balóra xalánğit (for a brand new, beautiful marble), min ğoz (see below), franği ("European"), abu ğílde (nickname), and many others.

The idiom min ğoz "from the pair" (between the two), produced an interesting semantic shift. It was originally used as an announcement on the part of a player who was aiming at two adjacent marbles, i.e. that if he hits either one or both that it would be o.k. Now, if he missed both, his colleagues would usually exclaim lo ba-min ve-lo ba-ğoz "neither in the min nor in the ğoz," i.e., he hit neither the one nor the other. Thus, these two words min "from" and ğoz "pair" were taken to be referring individually to the marbles involved.

In connection with franği we might mention forms like fasfus "tiny,"[49] fistuk "peanuts," falafel "faláfel, a spicy oriental food with a lot of filfil 'pepper,'" fálta "slip" and the verb derived from it hitfalet "slipped," and many others. The reason for mentioning this group is that all of them violate the basic Hebrew phonological rules of the complementary distribution of /b g d k p t/, especially of /b k p/ which are generally preserved to date in formal Hebrew. I will not discuss here the entire rule,[50] but mention only one aspect of it, i.e. that in initial position and after a consonant only the plosive allophone may appear, and in final position, following a vowel--only the fricative allophone may be used. In our examples all initial and post consonantal positions were occupied by [f] as in Arabic rather than by [p] as required by Hebrew phonology. The same applies to euphemistic forms which were apparently created by the children through multiple contaminations between Arabic, Hebrew, and Yiddish[51] (details elsewhere), e.g. fisfes "to miss, fail," figšeš/fikšeš "to miss," fikfek "to miss" and "secondary" and "tertiary" derivations and mock derivations, such as

finlosux "fail," and the like.

On the other hand, in forms like xabub "darling (masc.)," ya xabibi "oh my darling (masc.)," rizdeb, rizdub (see below), akrab "scorpion" (akrav in Hebrew!!), we have the stop allophone instead of the fricate!

What all that means is that penetration of so many violations of the basic Hebrew phonological rules do not just "remain in the lexicon." In due course they affect the entire phonological system, which in my judgment was the case here too, i.e. children will often do the same thing in indigenous Hebrew roots too (as we described in other studies).

As for morphology, while the inflection of the noun was practically bypassed by the children, as mentioned above (by resorting to the construction Noun + šel-, etc.), the children were very active in the inflection of the verb (of course, with very substantial changes which they introduced)[52] as they were in the processes of derivation.

We will mention here only one aspect--the derivation of verbs from borrowed nouns, singling out a few instances which affect the Hebrew root system.

We have just mentioned some effects on Hebrew phonology in forms like hitfalet, fisfes, rizdeb, fikšeš, which according to strict Hebrew phonology should have been hitpalet, pispes, rizdev, pikšeš, etc. Some of those examples illustrate another point, i.e. derivation of verbs from nouns and from quadriliteral roots rather than triliteral.

We mentioned before that the flexion of the noun was almost completely abandoned by the children. This means, among other things, that borrowed nouns could remain not bothered by the Hebrew morphological patterns and paradigms (flexion), not even by the stress system, except for the suffixing of the gender and number morphemes. As mentioned above, the borrowed

nouns retain the stress on the original syllable and the singular feminine and the plural endings are appended without any significant morphophonemic changes. Thus, the Hebrew noun became an open category.

The verb, however, is a dynamic one. It maintains its conjugations and its inflected paradigms. It assimilates whatever it absorbs, by means of its paradigms. In this way, the verb could not only "Hebraize" foreign roots, but also conceal their foreign origin, except that the children "spoiled" it to some extent by leaving certain alien phonological features (see some examples above) and by their excessive derivation of quadriliteral roots from borrowed words. It is true that historical Hebrew had some quadriliteral roots before, but it was basically a triliteral system. By deriving large numbers of quadriliteral verbs, especially from borrowed words, the children contributed significantly to the change in the appearance of the Hebrew verbal system and the ratio between the triliteral roots (which is a typical Semitic feature) and the quadriliteral (and even five-radical) roots.

We mentioned several examples. We might add timbel "to stupify" from tembel "stupid, a fool" (Arabic tanbal from Turkish tembel), and the most popular verb xirbén "to mess up, fix, etc." which is derived from xerbón "excrement, a mess, a fix, defeat, etc.," which in turn is derived through a contamination with the Arabic word xara "excrement." All of those forms, like many others, have later moved on to the language of the youth and adults.

There are scores of other interesting cases, but we will mention here only one more type of interference from Arabic which concerns the syntax of the verb and verb phrase constructions: following the Arabic, the children will usually say caxak al- "laugh at (lit. laugh on)" instead of the preferred form caxak lə... (lit. laugh to...), and similar uses.

Of special interest are, for instance, constructions with the verb axal "to eat" which are influenced by Arabic, e.g. axal makot "he ate blows (i.e. was hit, spanked)"; axal xerbon "he ate a defeat, failure (got in a fix)"; axal xazuk--in the same meaning, xazuk being an Arabic word meaning here like xerbon "failure," which was one of the original uses borrowed directly from Arabic, then inspired the creation of Hebraized and Hebrew constructionson this pattern.

8. Summary

We have seen how modern Hebrew came into being as a revived living language, the sociolinguistic background, the contribution of various factions and factors to its development, and the role of the children in it too.

In that context we studied the processes of the nativization of the language by the children, how they created mainly by themselves a new "language of games," how they borrowed terms and expressions from Arabic, and how they initiated various processes of Arabic interference in Hebrew, some of which spread beyond the confines of the children's language of games, into the general language, and affected Hebrew phonology, derivation and morphology, syntax and semantics.(Note also their contribution to Hebrew slang.)

From the point of view of bilingualism we have seen again that national bilingualism does not necessarily imply individual bilingualism. However, given a special sociolinguistic setting (like in the case of a revived language, where children may feel a special deficiency in their special areas of language and lore and fun), certain reasons for borrowing may arise, and certain patterns of interference evolve.

Contacts between languages really starts with the contact between individuals, which in turn may be multiplied and reinforced by the number

of people involved. However, as we have seen in our case, only some effects of borrowing and interference are due to the proficient bilinguals (e.g., loan translations), whereas other processes and effects (e.g., loan-shifts, hybrid creations) are due to the activities of the innocent "fragmentary bilinguals." The actual impact of the latter on the borrowing language may be greater than that of the former, so that, from a certain point of view, there is an inverse correlation between proficiency and interference.

Children's bilingualism in an immigrant society has its own features, particularly in the case of a revived language. Here they are especially free to create in their own way, borrow in their own way, and nativize the language in their own way. While transmitting it to the densely succeeding new generations of children their innovations and borrowings go into greater circulation and sooner or later they may affect the entire linguistic system, whether the adults realized it or not, as was in our case.

Footnotes

[1]He is called by many "The Reviver of Hebrew Speech," but there were others who objected to it. See details in A. Bar-Adon, "Processes of Nativization in Contemporary Hebrew," in On the Revival of Modern Hebrew, ed. A. Bar Adon (forthcoming), and The Rise and Decline of a Dialect (A Study in the Revival of Modern Hebrew), The Hague: Mouton (in press). Also "S. Y. Agnon and the Revival of Modern Hebrew," in Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 1971/72 (in press).

[2]Cf. S. Morag, "Planned and Unplanned Developments in Modern Hebrew," Lingua, 8 (1959): 248, fn. 1.

[3]Cf. E. Haugen, The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior, Philadelphia, 1953.

[4]Cf. U. Weinreich, Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems, New York, 1953; Joshua A. Fishman, "Language Maintenance and Language Shift: The American Immigrant Case within a General Theoretical Perspective," 1964 (mimeo); id., "Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry," Linguistics, 9 (1964):32-70; id., "Domains of Language Choice in Multilingual Settings," 1964 (mimeo); "Yiddish in America: Socio-Linguistic Description and Analysis," International Journal of Linguistics, 31 (1965), No. 2, Part II, 94 pp.; id., Language Loyalty in the United States, The Hague: Mouton, 1966, and other studies.

[5]There were numerous other languages used by sub-groups of the Jewish component and by small minority groups of the rest of the population, but we do not need to deal with them here.

[6]Strictly speaking, this term of Sephardim should apply only to Jews of Spanish origin, as the name Sepharad suggests. Sepharad is the Hebrew name for "Spain," and, indeed, the descendants of the original Spanish Jews (who were expelled from Spain in 1492) did mostly speak Ladino, i.e., Judeo-Spanish.

[7]Things have changed again in the 1950's, following the forced mass emigration of Jews from various Arab countries and their immigration to Israel. Yet, the Israeli culture is still predominantly "Ashkenazi," European.

[8]In the Arab sector there were fewer people who acquired Hebrew. Cf. fn. 25.

[9]E.g., W. F. Mackey, Bilingualism as a World Problem, Montreal: Harvest House, 1967.

[10]See fn. 26.

[11]In "The Role of Language in Forging a Nation: The Case of Hebrew," The Incorporated Linguist, January 1970.

[12]A. N. Poliak, The Jews in Palestine at the End of the War, Merhavia, 1945, 27-34.

[13]Quote from Rabin, ibid.

[14]Interestingly enough, even as late as 1943, the struggle against Yiddish by Hebrew zealots was still going on. Following an act of violence against a Yiddish paper, on June 29, 1943, a hot debate was conducted by the leaders of the Histadrut (The Workers Union), and one of the leaders of a leftist Party (Mr. M. Ya'ari) made a typical statement: "I have the greatest love for Yiddish, but I object to it in the Land of Israel."--See Korot, Ed. J. Olitzky, Vol. 2 (1971), No. 6 (18), pp. 16 ff.

[15]Hevley Tarbut ("Culture Pangs"), Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1946. See especially p. 24.

[16]It is treated in detail in a forthcoming study on the History of the Revival of Modern Hebrew.

[17]Cf. H. Blanc, "Some Yiddish Influences in Israeli Hebrew," in U. Weinreich (ed.), The Field of Yiddish, II, The Hague: Mouton, 1965, 185-201.

[18]Cf. Noam Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1965; id., "The Formal Nature of Language," Appendix A, in E. Lenneberg's Biological Foundations of Language, New York: Wiley, 1967, 397-442, and in other publications (listed in A. Bar-Adon, below). Also, J. J. Katz, The Philosophy of Language, New York: Harper & Row, 1966 (esp. pp. 240-283); David McNeill, "Developmental Psycholinguistics," in Smith and Miller (eds.), The Genesis of Language, Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1966. More details and further bibliography in A. Bar-Adon, "Primary Syntactic Structures in Hebrew Child Language," in A. Bar-Adon and W. F. Leopold (eds.), Child Language: A Book of Readings, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971, pp. 433-72.

[19]See details in A. Bar-Adon, The Rise and Decline of a Dialect: A Study in the Revival of Modern Hebrew, Mouton (in press).

[20]Among them most of the recent or current leaders of the State of Israel; e.g., the former Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, the late President Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, the present President S. Z. Shazar, and many others.

[21]See details in my Children's Hebrew in Israel, 2 vols., Jerusalem, 1959 (in Hebrew, with English summary), and "Analogy and Analogic Change as Reflected in Contemporary Hebrew," in Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, ed. H. Lunt, The Hague: Mouton, 1964: 758-63.

[22]For details on nativization see my "Processes of Nativization in Contemporary Hebrew."

[23]Examples and details are included in "Processes of Nativization...," and "Analogy and Analogic Change...," mentioned above.

[24]I might add for the sociology student that it was normalize. -y the subsequent generations of native parents.

[25]We mentioned in footnote 8 that there were more Hebrew-Arabic bilinguals than Arabic-Hebrew bilinguals. In other words, Arabs made a lesser effort in acquiring Hebrew (and this is not the place to analyze this sociolinguistic phenomenon), but there definitely were some who did it, e.g. the children of the Arab village of Ja'uni in Upper-Galilee which was adjacent to the Hebrew village of Rosh-Pinnah. Those children even learned it formally for some time at school from a Jewish teacher, in addition to playing with their Hebrew neighbors.

[26]As Ben-Yehuda himself stated in the Introduction volume to his Thesaurus (p. 10), he made a special effort to liken the Hebrew roots to those of Arabic. For details cf. I. Avineri, Kibbushey Ha'ivrit bədorenu, Marhavia, 1946; M. Piamenta, "The Influence of Arabic on Ben-Yehuda's innovations," Leshonenu La'am, 12 (1961): 150-58 (both in Hebrew).

[27]It should be noted that many Yiddish-speaking children of the veteran population (the "Old Yishuv") of the Holy Cities in Palestine knew Arabic. In effect, many Jews in the Old City of Jerusalem, in Zefat, and Tiberias, and perhaps elsewhere, were pretty fluent in all the three major vernaculars, i.e. Arabic, Ladino, and Hiddish. Then Hebrew was added to them, until it captured the hegemony.

[28]Cf. U. Weinreich, Languages in Contact, New York, 1953, p. 471.

[29]"The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," Language, 26 (1950), p. 210f.; in revised form in The Norwegian Language in America, 1953, Vol. 2, 383f.; cf. Bilingualism in the Americas, 1956, p. 14 and subsequent studies. (Cf. his quotation from Hermann Paul's Prinzipien, 1886, Chapter 22.)

[30]In the 1940's there was a special flourishing of a Hebrew style flavored with an excessive display of Arabic words and Arabicized structures, used especially by the young men of the "Palmakh," the underground commando. But we cannot elaborate here on this beyond stating that it was essentially, in my opinion, an extension of the special Hebrew of game and fun of the children, as described before.

[31]/ballo:ra/is probably connected with classical Arabic /billawr/ "beryl," and the /l/ is therefore the original sound, rather than /n/, in /bannu:ra/(see below).

[32]But this coincides with a host of forms in the Hebrew "language of game" which were made penultimate by the children, e.g., /klafím/ "cards" (used by adults) vs. /kláfim/ "cards" used by children; /prasím/ "prizes"--/prásim/ "pictures, and similar little 'prizes,' found in chocolate boxes, etc."

[33]It seems, that the form with /l/, not /n/, seems to be the basic one (cf. fn, 31).

[34]"On the Arabic Elements in Spoken Israeli Hebrew," Leshonenu La'am, 6 (1954/55): (No. 1): 6-14, (No. 2): 27-32, (No. 4): 20-26. In Hebrew.

[35]Op. cit., No. 2-3, pp. 28-29.

[36]Arabic ğahánnam may be derived from Hebrew geyhinnóm "the Valley of Hinnom, Hell," but the lay speakers are, of course, not aware of such a possible etymology.

[37]And indeed we heard lağanna too. Cf. A. Bar-Adon, "Studies in the Lexicon of the Israeli Children," Leshonenu La'am, 18 (1966-67), No. 2, esp. p. 64. In Hebrew.

[38]In Atidot, A Quarterly for Youth, Summer 1956 and Fall 1957, pp. 5-10.

[39]The Hebrew text is not vocalized, and the same symbol /w/ stands for both [u] and [o]. Hence, one may read it either [bandúra] or [bandóra].

[40]Most importantly, similar evidence is found also in the aforementioned study by Haim Blanc, who is a great authority on Arabic dialects. He emphasizes that in all the Arabic dialects known to him, the actualization is [g], not [j]. See Leshonenu L'am, 6 (1954/55), No. 2-3, pp. 27-28.

[41]By the way, an etymological survey leads me to the assumption that this Arabic word was influenced by Turkish....

[42]A borrowed word in its plural form may be conceived as a singular in the recipient language. When it has to be pluralized in the latter, its original plural marker will be disregarded, and a new plural marker will be superimposed on it; e.g., "Eskimos" in Hebrew are eskimosim, where the Hebrew plural marker -im was appended to eskimos.

[43]I.e., disregard for the original gender; cf. the use of "abu-" below.

[44]Cf. Weinreich, 1953; Haugen (1950); (1953); (1956), which were mentioned above, and in his new concise essay on "Bilingualism, Language Contact, and Immigrant Languages in the United States: A Research Report, 1956-1970 (mimeo 1970-71), to appear in Current Trends in Linguistics, ed. T. A. Sebeok, Vol. 10, The Hague: Mouton. We could mention also Vildomec, and others, but it is not our intention here to give a full bibliography.

[45]As Haugen calls it. See Haugen 1956, etc.

[46]Originally a relativization marker. Cf. Y. Hayon, "Relativization in Hebrew: A Transformational Approach," an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1969. A Bar-Adon, "Primary Syntactic Structures in Hebrew Child Language," in A. Bar-Adon and W. F. Leopold, Child Language: A Book of Readings, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971, 433-72, esp. p. 456 f. See bibl. in f.n. 57 there.

[47]There is a similar expression in Yiddish too, but in different word order, which add support to the original derivation from Arabic. Yiddish perhaps provided reinforcement.

[48]In my opinion, it started here too with the proficient bilinguals, although the etymology of abuk could easily be found by any Hebrew speaker. I think that the form 'i(ʕ)al avíxa was also used more by oriental Jewish children, like in the case of abu miškafayim.

[49]Originally meaning "a flea; a wart." It is often used with the aforementioned Hebrew diminutive -on, i.e. fasfuson, and even with one or more of the diminutive and endearment morphemes borrowed from Yiddish, e.g., fasfusončik...

[50]Which I do to some extent in The Rise and Decline of a Dialect.

[51]Naturally, the interference of Yiddish is also part of that child bilingualism, but we are now concerned mainly with the Arabic effects.

[52]See details in our Childrens Hebrew ... and "Analogy ..."